



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

*Cur*

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/583,612

06/20/2006

Mark Alan Schultz

PU030327

5962

24498 7590 11/28/2007  
THOMSON LICENSING LLC  
Two Independence Way  
Suite 200  
PRINCETON, NJ 08540

EXAMINER

BLACKMAN, ROCHELLE ANN J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2862

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

11/28/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/583,612

Applicant(s)

SCHULTZ ET AL.

Examiner

Rochelle Blackman

Art Unit

2862

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 August 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 29 August 2007 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Arguments*

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-7 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1, 2, and 5-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Safran et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0058416) in view of Keelan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,537,166).

Regarding claim 1, Safran discloses a projection system (see FIGS. 1-3), comprising: a plurality of displays (see 30 of FIGS. 1-3 and paragraph [0029]) arranged adjacent to each other to form a screen; a plurality of projectors (see 20 of FIGS. 1-3), one corresponding to each display of the plurality of displays, wherein each projector includes a lens (although not shown, "projectors" 20 are considered to have lens in order to function).

Application/Control Number:  
10/583,612  
Art Unit: 2862

Page 3

Regarding claim 2, Safran discloses the projection system of claim 1 wherein the plurality of displays are arranged in an  $N \times 1$  array (the plurality of displays in 30 are arranged in a  $3 \times 1$  array in FIGS. 1C, 2, and 3).

Regarding claims 1 and 5-7, Safran does not appear disclose "a mask assembly disposed between and surrounding each lens of the plurality of projectors and the corresponding plurality of displays; wherein the mask assembly includes a mask frame and a mask; wherein the mask is moveable relative to the mask frame; and wherein the mask is disposed on the lens".

Keelan teaches providing a mask assembly (see 10 of FIGS. 1-3) disposed between and surrounding a lens (see 28 of FIG. 3) of a projector (see 32 of FIG. 3); wherein the mask assembly includes a mask frame (see 11 of FIGS. 1 and 2) and a mask (see 12 of FIG 1); wherein the mask is moveable relative to the mask frame (see col. 2, line 65 to col. 3, line 2); and wherein the mask is disposed on the lens (see 10 relative to 28 in FIG. 3).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to provide the "projection system" of the Safran reference with a "mask assembly" with above-mentioned features, as taught by Keelan for purpose of enhancing the luminance of an image projected by the projectors and reducing the space taken up by the arrangement of elements within the "projection system", thus providing a more compact "projection system".

2. Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Safran et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0058416) in view of Keelan

et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,537,166) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Yamanaka (U.S. Patent No. 6,637,887).

Safran and Keelan disclose the claimed invention except for wherein each of the plurality of projectors further includes "a mirror"; and wherein the mirror is "aligned at an angle of about 45 degrees with respect to a lamp of the projector".

Yamanaka teaches providing each of a plurality of projectors (see 1 of FIG. 1) that includes a mirror (for example, see 23 and 24 of FIG. 20); and wherein the mirror is aligned at an angle of about 45 degrees (see position of 23 and 24 in FIG. 20) in with respect to a lamp (see 11 of FIG. 20) of the projector.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to the plurality of projectors of the "projection system" of the combined Safran and Keelan reference with a mirror and the above-mentioned arrangement thereof, as taught by Yamanaka for the purpose of directing the light from lamp of each of the plurality of projectors towards the lens of each of the plurality of projectors.

### **Conclusion**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rochelle Blackman whose telephone number is (571) 272-2113. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patrick Assouad can be reached on (571) 272-2210. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number:  
10/583,612  
Art Unit: 2862

Page 5

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

RB

  
ROCHELLE BLACKMAN  
PRIMARY EXAMINER